# Bogoliubov Fermi Surfaces in Superconductors with Broken Time-Reversal Symmetry

D. F. Agterberg,[1,*] P. M. R. Brydon,[2,†] and C. Timm[3,‡]

[1]*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI 53201, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics, University of Otago, P.O. Box 56, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand*
[3]*Institute of Theoretical Physics, Technische Universität Dresden, 01062 Dresden, Germany*

(Dated: March 28, 2017)

It is commonly believed that in the absence of disorder or an external magnetic field, there are three possible types of superconducting excitation gaps: the gap is nodeless, it has point nodes, or it has line nodes. Here, we show that for an even-parity nodal superconducting state which spontaneously breaks time-reversal symmetry, the low-energy excitation spectrum generally does not belong to any of these categories; instead it has extended Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces. These Fermi surfaces can be visualized as two-dimensional surfaces generated by "inflating" point or line nodes into spheroids or tori, respectively. These inflated nodes are topologically protected from being gapped by a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant, which we give in terms of a Pfaffian. We also show that superconducting states possessing these Fermi surfaces can be energetically stable. A crucial ingredient in our theory is that more than one band is involved in the pairing; since all candidate materials for even-parity superconductivity with broken time-reversal symmetry are multiband systems, we expect these $\mathbb{Z}_2$-protected Fermi surfaces to be ubiquitous.

arXiv:1608.06461v2 [cond-mat.supr-con] 25 Mar 2017

*Introduction.*—The theory of superconductivity is conventionally formulated in terms of pairing of spin-1/2 fermions [1, 2]. The complications introduced by additional electronic degrees of freedom, e.g., orbitals, are not usually thought to qualitatively alter the physics. This picture has recently been challenged for a number of materials. For iron-based superconductors, the role of interorbital pairing is attracting increased attention [3–6]. Another example is the nematic superconductivity of $Cu_xBi_2Se_3$ [7], where the odd parity of the gap is encoded in the orbital degrees of freedom. Furthermore, theories of pairing in YPtBi and $UPt_3$ based on $j = 3/2$ and $j = 5/2$ fermions, respectively, have greatly enriched the allowed superconducting states [8, 9].

In this Letter, we show that the presence of multiple bands qualitatively changes the nodal structure of a time-reversal-symmetry-breaking (TRSB) superconductor. Specifically, the expected line or point nodes of an even-parity superconducting gap [1, 2] are replaced by two-dimensional Fermi surfaces of Bogoliubov quasiparticles, which are topologically protected by a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant. We further interpret these Fermi surfaces in terms of a pseudomagnetic field arising from interband Cooper pairs, here referred to as "interband pairing".

Our conclusions are relevant for a wide range of candidate TRSB superconductors, such as $UPt_3$ [9–12], Th-doped $UBe_{13}$ [13, 14], $PrOs_4Sb_{12}$ [15], $Sr_2RuO_4$ [16, 17], $URu_2Si_2$ [18, 19], SrPtAs [20], and Bi/Ni bilayers [21]. Remarkably, signatures of these Fermi surfaces may have already been observed in Th-doped $UBe_{13}$ [14] (and possibly in $UPt_3$ [11]), where there is evidence for a nonzero density of states at zero temperature, which appears not to be due to impurities. In addition to these known superconductors, theory has predicted TRSB superconductivity in graphene [22, 23], the half-Heusler compound YPtBi [8], water-intercalated sodium cobaltate $Na_xCoO_2 \cdot yH_2O$ [24, 25], Cu-doped $TiSe_2$ [26], and monolayer transition metal dichalcogenides [27]. A common feature of all these materials is that the electronic structure involves multiple bands, and so we expect our theory to apply.

*Model.*—Our starting point is a general Hamiltonian with time-reversal and inversion symmetries containing four electronic degrees of freedom at each momentum. These four degrees of freedom can arise from either the combination of spin 1/2 and two orbitals of equal parity, or from fermions with effective angular momentum $j = 3/2$. We work with a $j = 3/2$ generalized Luttinger-Kohn Hamiltonian [28] in order to make our arguments most transparent. Although these two descriptions have different symmetry properties, we show in the Supplemental Material (SM) [29] that they can be unitarily transformed into each other and that our model represents a generic two-band theory including all symmetry-allowed crystal-field and spin-orbit-coupling terms. The general form of the normal-state Hamiltonian is

$$\begin{aligned} H_N = c_0 1_4 &+ c_{yz}\frac{J_yJ_z + J_zJ_y}{\sqrt{3}} + c_{xz}\frac{J_xJ_z + J_zJ_x}{\sqrt{3}} \\ &+ c_{xy}\frac{J_xJ_y + J_yJ_x}{\sqrt{3}} + c_{3z^2-r^2}\frac{2J_z^2 - J_x^2 - J_y^2}{3} \\ &+ c_{x^2-y^2}\frac{J_x^2 - J_y^2}{\sqrt{3}}, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $1_4$ is the $4 \times 4$ unit matrix, and the $J_i$ are spin-3/2 matrices given in the SM [29]. The coefficients $c_i = c_i(\mathbf{k})$ of the matrices in Eq. (1) are real, satisfy $c_i(\mathbf{k}) = c_i(-\mathbf{k})$, and transform in the same way as the corresponding matrix under spatial symmetries. $H_N$ has twofold degenerate eigenvalues $\epsilon_\pm = c_0 \pm (c_{yz}^2 + c_{xz}^2 + c_{xy}^2 + c_{3z^2-r^2}^2 + c_{x^2-y^2}^2)^{1/2}$. For definiteness, we discuss the case of only one of the two bands crossing the chemical potential so that there is only one normal-state Fermi

surface; if there are two, identical arguments pertain to both. While our conclusions are general, numerical results are given for the spherically symmetric Hamiltonian $H_N = \alpha k^2 + \beta\,(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{J})^2 - \mu$ [28], where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are constants ($\beta$ is the spin-orbit coupling) and $\mu$ is the chemical potential, which leads to $c_0 = (\alpha + 5\beta/4)k^2 - \mu$, $c_{3z^2-r^2} = \beta[k_z^2 - (k_x^2+k_y^2)/2]$, $c_{x^2-y^2} = \sqrt{3}\beta(k_x^2 - k_y^2)/2$, $c_{yz} = \sqrt{3}\beta k_y k_z$, $c_{xz} = \sqrt{3}\beta k_x k_z$, and $c_{xy} = \sqrt{3}\beta k_x k_y$.

The superconducting state is taken to have even parity. Fermionic antisymmetry permits six possible gap matrices $\eta_i$ in the spin-3/2 space: $\eta_s = U_T$, $\eta_{yz} = (J_yJ_z + J_zJ_y)U_T/\sqrt{3}$, $\eta_{xz} = (J_xJ_z + J_zJ_x)U_T/\sqrt{3}$, $\eta_{xy} = (J_xJ_y + J_yJ_x)U_T/\sqrt{3}$, $\eta_{3z^2-r^2} = (2J_z^2 - J_x^2 - J_y^2)U_T/3$, and $\eta_{x^2-y^2} = (J_x^2 - J_y^2)U_T/\sqrt{3}$, where

$$U_T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{2}$$

is the unitary part of the time-reversal operator $T = U_T\mathcal{K}$, with $\mathcal{K}$ denoting complex conjugation. The $\eta_s$ gap is a spin-singlet state and represents pure intraband pairing. The other gaps, however, describe spin-quintet ($J = 2$) pairs and involve both intra- and interband pairing [8]. Since we consider zero-momentum Cooper pairs, this implies that quintet pairing involves states away from the Fermi energy. A general superconducting state is a linear combination of these gap matrices with symmetry-compliant $\mathbf{k}$-dependent coefficients and is described by the Bogoliubov-de Gennes Hamiltonian

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = \begin{pmatrix} H_N(\mathbf{k}) & \Delta(\mathbf{k}) \\ \Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) & -H_N^T(-\mathbf{k}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

While our results apply to all TRSB even-parity superconducting states, for concreteness we consider the gap function

$$\Delta(\mathbf{k}) = \Delta_1\,\psi(\mathbf{k})\,\eta_s + \Delta_0\,(\eta_{xz} + i\eta_{yz}), \tag{4}$$

where $\Delta_1$ and $\Delta_0$ are real constants. Although the latter term describes purely on-site pairing, the gap matrix $\eta_{xz}+i\eta_{yz}$ transforms under rotations as the spherical harmonic $Y_{2,1}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})$, i.e., it is *chiral*. It generically accompanies a spin-singlet term with a form factor $\psi(\mathbf{k})$ of the same symmetry. Being chiral, this pairing state, which we call the $k_z(k_x + ik_y)$ state, breaks time-reversal symmetry. It has the same symmetry as proposed for $URu_2Si_2$ [18], YPtBi [8], and $UPt_3$ [11]. For pure singlet pairing (i.e., $\Delta_0 = 0$), the gap has line nodes in the $k_z = 0$ plane and point nodes on the $k_z$ axis ($k_x = k_y = 0$). Mixing in a quintet component has a dramatic effect on the excitation spectrum: *the expected point and line nodes are replaced by Fermi surfaces*. In Fig. 1, we plot these Fermi surfaces for the $k_z(k_x + ik_y)$ state. We find them to be a generic feature of all the TRSB even-parity states classified in [2]. As we will see below, these Fermi surfaces




FIG. 1. Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces of the superconducting $k_z(k_x+ik_y)$ state, shown here for the case where only one band has a Fermi surface. The normal-state Fermi surface, shown as the semitransparent sphere, is gapped out by the superconductivity. The point and line nodes of the single-band theory (red dots and line, respectively), however, are "inflated" into spheroidal and toroidal $\mathbb{Z}_2$-protected Fermi surfaces (orange surfaces).

bear some resemblance to those found in the presence of an exchange field [36], although they have a completely different origin.

*Existence of Fermi surfaces and $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant.*—We now show that Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces are a generic feature of the Hamiltonian in Eq. (3) and construct their topological invariant. The first step is to show that $H(\mathbf{k})$ can be unitarily transformed into an antisymmetric matrix, i.e., there exists a unitary $\Omega$ such that $\tilde{H}^T(\mathbf{k}) = -\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$ for $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger$. The main ideas of the proof are explained in the following, details and a representative $\Omega$ are given in the SM [29]. The Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{k})$ possesses charge-conjugation symmetry $C$ and parity symmetry $P$. $C$ acts as $U_C H^T(-\mathbf{k})U_C^\dagger = -H(\mathbf{k})$ with $U_C = \hat{\tau}_x \otimes 1_4$, where $\hat{\tau}_i$ are the Pauli matrices in particle-hole space, while $P$ acts as $U_P H(-\mathbf{k})U_P^\dagger = H(\mathbf{k})$ with $U_P = \hat{\tau}_0 \otimes 1_4$. Hence, $CP$ symmetry reads

$$U_{CP}\,H^T(\mathbf{k})\,U_{CP}^\dagger = -H(\mathbf{k}), \tag{5}$$

with $U_{CP} = U_C U_P^* = \hat{\tau}_x \otimes 1_4$. This implies that $(CP)^2 = U_{CP}U_{CP}^* = +1$ and thus $U_{CP} = U_{CP}^T$. Any symmetric matrix can be diagonalized by a unitary congruence, i.e., there exist a unitary $Q$ and a diagonal $\Lambda$ such that $U_{CP} = Q\Lambda Q^T$ with the *transposed* matrix $Q^T$. Insertion into Eq. (5) gives $Q\Lambda Q^T\,H^T(\mathbf{k})\,Q^*\Lambda^\dagger Q^\dagger = -H(\mathbf{k})$. Since $\Lambda$ is diagonal, we can define a square root $\sqrt{\Lambda}$. The sign of the root for each diagonal component of $\Lambda$ can be chosen arbitrarily and is then held fixed. This allows us to split

the unitary matrices in the $CP$ symmetry relation, which gives $(\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger H(\mathbf{k}) Q\sqrt{\Lambda})^T = -\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger H(\mathbf{k}) Q\sqrt{\Lambda}$. This can be written as $(\Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger)^T = -\Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger$ with $\Omega \equiv \sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger$. Hence, $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) = \Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger$ is antisymmetric, as we wanted to show. We can then define the Pfaffian $P(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \mathrm{Pf}\,\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$. Since $\det H(\mathbf{k}) = \det \tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) = P^2(\mathbf{k})$, the zeros of $P(\mathbf{k})$ give the zero-energy states of $H(\mathbf{k})$.

It has recently been shown that Fermi surfaces of Hamiltonians with $CP$ symmetry squaring to $+1$ can possess a non-trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge, making them topologically stable against $CP$-preserving perturbations [32, 33]. We now express the invariant in terms of the Pfaffian $P(\mathbf{k})$. The Pfaffian is real since it is a polynomial of even degree of the components of the matrix $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$, which is hermitian and antisymmetric and thus purely imaginary. Regions in momentum space in which $P(\mathbf{k})$ has opposite signs are thus necessarily separated by a two-dimensional (Fermi) surface on which $P(\mathbf{k}) = 0$. The existence of such Fermi surfaces is thus guaranteed if $P(\mathbf{k})$ changes sign and hence we can identify $(-1)^l = \mathrm{sgn}[P(\mathbf{k}_-)P(\mathbf{k}_+)]$ as the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant, where $\mathbf{k}_+$ ($\mathbf{k}_-$) refers to momenta inside (outside) of the Fermi surface.

Under what conditions do protected Fermi surfaces exist? In the normal state, the Pfaffian $P(\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon_+^2\epsilon_-^2$ is always non-negative and has second-order zeros on the Fermi surface. Hence, the normal-state Fermi surface is not protected by the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ charge. Furthermore, for *time-reversal-symmetric* superconductivity, $P(\mathbf{k})$ can also be chosen non-negative for all $\mathbf{k}$ so that there is no nontrivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant [32, 33]. Our proof in the SM [29] simplifies the earlier proof by Kobayashi *et al.* [32]. For TRSB pairing, the second-order zeros of $P(\mathbf{k})$ are generically (i.e., in the absence of additional symmetries or fine tuning) lifted, leading to $P(\mathbf{k}) > 0$ in a neighborhood of the former zero, or split into first-order zeros, in which case there is a region with $P(\mathbf{k}) < 0$. Such a region is bounded by a two-dimensional Fermi surface; as this shrinks to a point or line node in the limit of infinitesimal pairing, we call it an "inflated" node.

The existence of protected Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces is now illustrated for the $k_z(k_x+ik_y)$ state of Eq. (4). We restrict ourselves to pure quintet pairing but our results hold for any gap with nonzero quintet component, see the SM [29]. The Pfaffian is

$$P(\mathbf{k}) = \epsilon_+^2\epsilon_-^2 + 4\Delta_0^2\,(\epsilon_+\epsilon_- + c_{xz}^2 + c_{yz}^2), \qquad (6)$$

which is negative for all $\mathbf{k}$ such that $s_- < \epsilon_+\epsilon_- < s_+$, where $s_\pm = -2\Delta_0^2 \pm 2\Delta_0\,(\Delta_0^2 - c_{xz}^2 - c_{yz}^2)^{1/2}$. $s_+$ and $s_-$ exist and are distinct if the radicand is positive. In the plane $k_z = 0$ and along the line $k_x = k_y = 0$, this holds for *any* $\Delta_0 > 0$ since symmetry dictates that $c_{xz}^2 + c_{yz}^2$ vanishes there. We then find $s_- = -4\Delta_0^2 < 0$ and $s_+ = 0$, i.e., $s_+$ vanishes on the normal-state Fermi surface. Since $\epsilon_+\epsilon_-$ changes sign across the normal-state Fermi surface, there is always a region with $s_- < \epsilon_+\epsilon_- < s_+$ in this plane and along this line and, due to the continuity of the $c_i(\mathbf{k})$, also in their neighborhood. The resulting region with $P(\mathbf{k}) < 0$ is bounded by a Fermi surface, as illustrated in Fig. 1.

*Stability of Fermi surfaces.*—Even-parity TRSB superconductors are usually argued to be energetically favored over time-reversal-symmetric states because they maximize the gap in momentum space [2]. The existence of extended Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces invalidates this argument. To show that TRSB states can nevertheless be stable, we consider a model with an on-site pairing interaction of strength $V$ in both the quintet $\eta_{xz}$ and $\eta_{yz}$ channels. In this case, the TRSB state $\Delta_0\,(\eta_{xz} + i\eta_{yz})$ [i.e., the $k_z(k_x + ik_y)$ state introduced above] and the time-reversal symmetric state $\sqrt{2}\,\Delta_0\,\eta_{xz}$ have the same critical temperature $T_c$. To decide which is energetically stable at temperatures $T$ near $T_c$, we perform a standard expansion of the free energy $F$ in the gap $\Delta$ [34, 35],

$$F = \frac{1}{2V}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\Delta^\dagger\Delta + \frac{k_BT}{2}\sum_{\mathbf{k},\omega_n}\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{l}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Delta\tilde{G}(\mathbf{k},\omega_n)\Delta^\dagger G(\mathbf{k},\omega_n)\right]^l, \qquad (7)$$

where $G(\mathbf{k},\omega_n)$ and $\tilde{G}(\mathbf{k},\omega_n)$ are the normal-state electron and hole Matsubara Green's functions, respectively. For vanishing spin-orbit coupling $\beta$, introduced below Eq. (1), the normal bands are fourfold degenerate. As was previously shown in the context of $j = 3/2$ pairing in cold atoms [34], the TRSB state is *unstable* towards the time-reversal symmetric state in this limit, as it leaves two of these bands ungapped. Nonzero spin-orbit coupling partially lifts this degeneracy and allows the TRSB state to open a gap on all Fermi surfaces, reducing its energy. An analysis of the fourth-order term in Eq. (7) predicts that the TRSB $\eta_{xz} + i\eta_{yz}$ state is energetically favored for $|\beta|k_F^2/k_BT_c \gtrsim 9.324$. Details are given in the SM [29]. Hence, the presence of the Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces does not necessarily compromise the stability of TRSB states.

*Pairing-induced pseudomagnetic field.*—To gain additional insight into the Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces, it is useful to rewrite the Hamiltonian in a basis for which the normal-state Hamiltonian is diagonal. We denote the eigenvectors of $H_N$ to the twofold degenerate eigenvalues $\epsilon_\pm$ by $|\pm, i{=}1,2\rangle$, which we choose to form a pseudospin basis, i.e., $|\pm,2\rangle = PT\,|\pm,1\rangle$. In this basis, the superconducting state is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\bar{H} = \begin{pmatrix} H_{N,+} & \Delta_{++} & 0 & \Delta_{+-} \\ \Delta_{++}^\dagger & -H_{N,+} & -\Delta_{+-}^* & 0 \\ 0 & -\Delta_{+-}^T & H_{N,-} & \Delta_{--} \\ \Delta_{+-}^\dagger & 0 & \Delta_{--}^\dagger & -H_{N,-} \end{pmatrix}. \qquad (8)$$

Here, $H_{N,\pm} = \epsilon_\pm\hat{\sigma}_0$ and $\Delta_{\pm\pm}$ are antisymmetric matrices with $\Delta_{\pm\pm} = \psi_\pm(\mathbf{k})\,i\hat{\sigma}_y$, where $\hat{\sigma}_\mu$ are the Pauli matrices in pseudospin space. $\Delta_{+-}$ is the interband pairing potential, the explicit form of which depends on the

choice of bases in the two-dimensional eigenspaces of $\epsilon_\pm$ and is hence not illuminating. The intraband gap functions $\psi_\pm(\mathbf{k})$ are obtained by transforming Eq. (4) into the pseudospin basis and are given by

$$\psi_\pm(\mathbf{k}) = \Delta_1\psi(\mathbf{k}) \pm 2\Delta_0 \frac{c_{xz}(\mathbf{k}) + ic_{yz}(\mathbf{k})}{\epsilon_+(\mathbf{k}) - \epsilon_-(\mathbf{k})}. \quad (9)$$

In the absence of $\Delta_{+-}$, $\bar{H}$ would describe two decoupled pseudospin-1/2 singlet superconductors with, at most, line or point nodes. Hence, the interband pairing is responsible for the appearance of the extended Fermi surfaces. This can be shown by treating the off-diagonal interband blocks of Eq. (8) as a perturbation to the intraband Hamiltonians: focusing on the + states (analogous results can be found for the − states if they have a normal-state Fermi surface), the second-order corrections due to the interband pairing appear only in the normal-state components, which become

$$H'_{N,+} = [\epsilon_+ + \gamma(\mathbf{k})]\,\hat{\sigma}_0 + \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}, \quad (10)$$

where

$$\gamma(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{2|\Delta_0|^2}{(\epsilon_+ - \epsilon_-)^3}\left[(\epsilon_+ - \epsilon_-)^2 - 2c_{yz}^2 - 2c_{xz}^2\right], \quad (11)$$

$$|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})| = \frac{4|\Delta_0|^2}{(\epsilon_+ - \epsilon_-)^2}\sqrt{c_{3z^2-r^2}^2 + c_{x^2-y^2}^2 + c_{xy}^2}. \quad (12)$$

The direction of $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})$ is basis-dependent and is thus not physically meaningful. The correction $\gamma(\mathbf{k})$ is always present and results in a small modification of the normal-state dispersion $\epsilon_+$, whereas the second term $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})\cdot\hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ only appears for TRSB gaps. This reveals that in the TRSB state the *interband pairing manifests itself as a pseudomagnetic field in the normal-state Hamiltonian.*

The origin of the extended Fermi surfaces becomes clear from the excitation spectrum of the low-energy pairing Hamiltonian,

$$E_{\mathbf{k},\pm,\nu} = \nu|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})| \pm \sqrt{[\epsilon_+(\mathbf{k}) + \gamma(\mathbf{k})]^2 + |\psi_+(\mathbf{k})|^2}, \quad (13)$$

where $\nu = \pm 1$. The pseudomagnetic field $|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})|$ evidently splits the dispersion. The square root in Eq. (13) goes to zero at the intersection of the nodes of the intraband gap $\psi_+(\mathbf{k})$ with the surface $\epsilon_+ + \gamma(\mathbf{k}) = 0$, and the pseudomagnetic field gives rise to the Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces by shifting the nodes to finite energies $\pm|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})|$. The generation of $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{k})$ by the superconducting state itself exhibits the *intrinsic* nature of the Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces. This distinguishes our results from the "breached-pairing" state of population-imbalanced cold atoms or exchange-split superconductors, where the required breaking of time-reversal symmetry is *extrinsic* to the pairing [36, 37].

The low-energy effective model also allows us to estimate the dimensions of the Fermi surfaces. Perpendicular to the normal-state Fermi surface, the Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces have a width $\delta k_\perp/k_F \sim \Delta_0^2/[\mu(\epsilon_+ - \epsilon_-)]$, where $k_F$ is the normal-state Fermi momentum. Their width in the direction parallel to the normal-state Fermi surface is $\delta k_\parallel/k_F \sim \Delta_0/(\epsilon_+ - \epsilon_-)$. Since we typically expect $\Delta_0 \ll \mu$, we find that $\delta k_\perp \ll \delta k_\parallel$, which implies oblate spheroidal Fermi surfaces near the original point nodes and flattened toroidal Fermi surfaces near the original line nodes, as seen in Fig. 1.

Pseudomagnetic fields appear in any TRSB phase of our model with interband (spin-quintet) pairs. Our analysis generalizes to other systems with multiband pairing: we expect non-vanishing contributions to the pseudomagnetic field from all the interband potentials, implying that Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces are a generic feature of such systems. Equation (12) shows that these Fermi surfaces will be largest in strong-coupling materials in which the different bands lie close to each other. These conditions are likely satisfied in heavy-fermion superconductors such as $UPt_3$, Th-doped $UBe_{13}$, $PrOs_4Sb_{12}$, and $URu_2Si_2$, which makes them ideal systems in which to search for Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces. Indeed, as mentioned in the Introduction, Th-doped $UBe_{13}$ shows a large (and so far unexplained) residual density of states [14] which is consistent with our theory.

*Conclusions.*—We have established that broken-time-reversal even-parity superconductors generically support two-dimensional Fermi surfaces. The states at these Fermi surfaces are charge-neutral Bogoliubov quasiparticles. The Fermi surfaces are protected by a topological $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant, which can be written in terms of a Pfaffian, and thus cannot be removed by any perturbation that is $CP$ invariant. They are also energetically stable for plausible parameters, i.e., the corresponding state has lower free energy than an associated time-reversal-symmetric state. The $\mathbb{Z}_2$-protected Fermi surfaces appear in multiband systems, where interband pairing produces an effective pseudomagnetic field, which "inflates" the expected point or line nodes. Since all candidate materials for TRSB even-parity superconductivity have multiple relevant bands, we expect that these $\mathbb{Z}_2$-protected Fermi surfaces are ubiquitous. The existence of Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces in the superconducting state should lead to characteristic experimental consequences: a nonzero density of states at the Fermi energy, visible for example in tunneling and photoemission experiments, would coexist with ideal conductivity and flux expulsion. The low-temperature thermodynamic response would show a linear temperature dependence of the specific heat, and heat conduction should also be unconventional [36]. Such anomalies may have already been observed in heavy-fermion superconductors [11, 14]. Our work raises many interesting new questions, e.g., is a superconductor with Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces a Fermi liquid when residual interactions are taken into account? The search for and study of such systems thus constitutes a very promising task for future research.

The authors thank A. P. Schnyder and M. Punk for useful discussions. D. F. A. was supported by the National Science Foundation grant DMR-1335215. C. T. acknowledges financial support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, in part through Research Training Group GRK 1621 and Collaborative Research Center SFB 1143.

* agterber@uwm.edu
† philip.brydon@otago.ac.nz
‡ carsten.timm@tu-dresden.de

[1] G. E. Volovik and L. P. Gor'kov, Superconducting classes in heavy-fermion systems, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **88**, 1412 (1985).

[2] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Phenomenological theory of unconventional superconductivity, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63**, 239 (1991).

[3] Y. Gao, W.-P. Su, and J.-X. Zhu, Interorbital pairing and its physical consequences for iron pnictide superconductors, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 104504 (2010).

[4] A. Nicholson, W. Ge, J. Riera, M. Daghofer, A. Moreo, and E. Dagotto, Pairing symmetries of a hole-doped extended two-orbital model for the pnictides, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 024532 (2012).

[5] R. Nourafkan, G. Kotliar, A. S. Tremblay, Correlation-Enhanced Odd-Parity Interorbital Singlet Pairing in the Iron-Pnictide Superconductor LiFeAs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 137001 (2016).

[6] T. Ong, P. Coleman, and J. Schmalian, Concealed $d$-wave pairs in the $s^{\pm}$ condensate of iron-based superconductors, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **113**, 5486 (2016).

[7] L. Fu, Odd-parity topological superconductor with nematic order: Application to $Cu_xBi_2Se_3$, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 100509(R) (2014); S. Yonezawa, K. Tajiri, S. Nakata, Y. Nagai, Z. Wang, K. Segawa, Y. Ando, and Y. Maeno, Thermodynamic evidence for nematic superconductivity in $Cu_xBi_2Se_3$, Nature Phys. **13**, 123 (2017).

[8] P. M. R. Brydon, L. M. Wang, M. Weinert, and D. F. Agterberg, Pairing of $j = 3/2$ Fermions in Half-Heusler Superconductors, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 177001 (2016); H. Kim, K. Wang, Y. Nakajima, R. Hu, S. Ziemak, P. Syers, L. Wang, H. Hodovanets, J. D. Denlinger, P. M. R. Brydon, D. F. Agterberg, M. A. Tanatar, R. Prozorov, amd J. Paglione, Beyond Triplet: Unconventional Superconductivity in a Spin-3/2 Topological Semimetal, arXiv:1603.03375 (2016).

[9] T. Nomoto and H. Ikeda, Exotic Multigap Structure in $UPt_3$ Unveiled by a First-Principles Analysis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 217002 (2016); T. Nomoto, K. Hattori, and H. Ikeda, Classification of "multipole" superconductivity in multiorbital systems and its implications, Phys. Rev. B **94**, 174513 (2016).

[10] G. M. Luke, A. Keren, L. P. Le, W. D. Wu, Y. J. Uemura, D. A. Bonn, L. Taillefer, and J. D. Garrett, Muon spin relaxation in $UPt_3$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1466 (1993).

[11] R. Joynt and L. Taillefer, The superconducting phases of $UPt_3$, Rev. Mod. Phys. **74**, 235 (2002).

[12] E. R. Schemm, W. J. Gannon, C. M. Wishne, W. P. Halperin, and A. Kapitulnik, Observation of broken time-reversal symmetry in the heavy-fermion superconductor $UPt_3$, Science **345**, 190 (2014).

[13] R. H. Heffner, J. L. Smith, J. O. Willis, P. Birrer, C. Baines, F. N. Gygax, B. Hitti, E. Lippelt, H. R. Ott, A. Schenck, E. A. Knetsch, J. A. Mydosh, and D. E. MacLaughlin, New phase diagram for (U,Th)$Be_{13}$: A muon-spin-resonance and $H_{c1}$ study, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2816 (1990).

[14] R. J. Zieve, R. Duke, and J. L. Smith, Pressure and linear heat capacity in the superconducting state of thoriated $UBe_{13}$, Phys. Rev. B **69**, 144503 (2004).

[15] Y. Aoki, A. Tsuchiya, T. Kanayama, S. R. Saha, H. Sugawara, H. Sato, W. Higemoto, A. Koda, K. Ohishi, K. Nishiyama, and R. Kadono, Time-Reversal Symmetry-Breaking Superconductivity in Heavy-Fermion $PrOs_4Sb_{12}$ Detected by Muon-Spin Relaxation, Phys. Rev. Lett **91**, 067003 (2003).

[16] G. M. Luke, Y. Fudamoto, K. M. Kojima, M. I. Larkin, J. Merrin, B. Nachumi, Y. J. Uemura, Y. Maeno, Z. Q. Mao, Y. Mori, H. Nakamura, and M. Sigrist, Time-Reversal Symmetry Breaking Superconductivity in $Sr_2RuO_4$, Nature **394**, 558 (1998).

[17] J. Xia, Y. Maeno, P. T. Beyersdorf, M. M. Fejer, and A. Kapitulnik, High Resolution Polar Kerr Effect Measurements of $Sr_2RuO_4$: Evidence for Broken Time-Reversal Symmetry in the Superconducting State, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 167002 (2006).

[18] Y. Kasahara, T. Iwasawa, H. Shishido, T. Shibauchi, K. Behnia, Y. Haga, T. D. Matsuda, Y. Onuki, M. Sigrist, and Y. Matsuda, Exotic Superconducting Properties in the Electron-Hole-Compensated Heavy-Fermion "Semimetal" $URu_2Si_2$, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 116402 (2007).

[19] E. R. Schemm, R. E. Baumbach, P. H. Tobash, F. Ronning, E. D. Bauer, and A. Kapitulnik, Evidence for broken time-reversal symmetry in the superconducting phase of $URu_2Si_2$, Phys. Rev. B **91**, 140506(R) (2015).

[20] P. K. Biswas, H. Luetkens, T. Neupert, T. Stürzer, C. Baines, G. Pascua, A. P. Schnyder, M. H. Fischer, J. Goryo, M. R. Lees, H. Maeter, F. Brückner, H.-H. Klauss, M. Nicklas, P. J. Baker, A. D. Hillier, M. Sigrist, A. Amato, and D. Johrendt, Evidence for superconductivity with broken time-reversal symmetry in locally noncentrosymmetric SrPtAs, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 180503(R) (2013).

[21] X. Gong, M. Kargarian, A. Stern, D. Yue, H. Zhou, X. Jin, V. M. Galitski, V. M. Yakovenko, and J. Xia, Time-Reversal-Symmetry-Breaking Superconductivity in Epitaxial Bismuth/Nickel Bilayers, arXiv:1609.08538 (2016).

[22] R. Nandkishore, L. S. Levitov, and A. V. Chubukov, Chiral superconductivity from repulsive interactions in doped graphene, Nature Phys. **8**, 158 (2012).

[23] A. Black-Schaffer and C. Honerkamp, Chiral $d$-wave superconductivity in doped graphene, J. Phys. Condens. Matter **26**, 423201 (2014).

[24] D. Sa, M. Sardar, and G. Baskaran, Superconductivity in $Na_xCoO_2 \cdot yH_2O$: Protection of a $d_1 + id_2$ state by spin-charge separation, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 104505 (2004).

[25] M. L. Kiesel, C. Platt, W. Hanke, and R. Thomale, Model Evidence of an Anisotropic Chiral $d+id$-Wave Pairing State for the Water-Intercalated $Na_xCoO_2 \cdot yH_2O$ Superconductor, Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 097001 (2013).

[26] R. Ganesh, G. Baskaran, J. van den Brink, and D. V. Efremov, Theoretical Prediction of a Time-Reversal Broken Chiral Superconducting Phase Driven by Electronic

Correlations in a Single $TiSe_2$ Layer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 177001 (2014).

[27] Y.-T. Hsu, A. Vaezi, M. H. Fischer, and E.-A. Kim, Topological superconductivity in monolayer transition metal dichalcogenides, arXiv:1606.00857 (2016).

[28] J. M. Luttinger and W. Kohn, Motion of Electrons and Holes in Perturbed Periodic Fields, Phys. Rev. **97**, 869 (1955).

[29] See Supplemental Material at http://link.aps.org/ supplemental/10.1103/XXX for details on the mapping between orbital and spin $j = 3/2$ representations, the properties of the Pfaffian, and the stability analysis. This includes Refs. [4, 31].

[30] D. Alekseevsky, A. Kriegl, P. W. Michor, and M. Losik, Choosing roots of polynomials smoothly, Israel J. Math. **105**, 203 (1998).

[31] N. D. Mermin, $d$-wave pairing near the transition temperature, Phys. Rev. A **9**, 868 (1974).

[32] S. Kobayashi, K. Shiozaki, Y. Tanaka, and M. Sato, Topological Blount's theorem of odd-parity superconductors, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 024516 (2014).

[33] Y. X. Zhao, A. P. Schnyder, and Z. D. Wang, Unified Theory of $PT$ and $CP$ Invariant Topological Metals and Nodal Superconductors, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 156402 (2016).

[34] T. L. Ho and S.-K. Yip, Pairing of Fermions with Arbitrary Spin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 247 (1999).

[35] V. P. Mineev and K. V. Samokhin, *Introduction to Unconventional Superconductivity* (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1999).

[36] E. Gubankova, E. G. Mishchenko, and F. Wilczek, Breached Superfluidity via $p$-Wave Coupling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 110402 (2005); Gapless surfaces in anisotropic superfluids, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 184516 (2006).

[37] W. V. Liu and F. Wilczek, Interior Gap Superfluidity, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 047002 (2003).

# Supplemental Material for
# Bogoliubov Fermi Surfaces in Superconductors with Broken Time-Reversal Symmetry

D. F. Agterberg, P. M. R. Brydon, and C. Timm

## MAPPING TO A GENERAL TWO-ORBITAL MODEL

In this section, we show that the most general model for a normal-state system with a two-valued orbital degree of freedom where the orbitals have the same parity and are chosen to be real can be unitarily transformed into the $j = 3/2$ Hamiltonian given in the main text. We expand the single-particle Hamiltonian in terms of Kronecker products in orbital-spin space,

$$H_N(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_{\mu,\nu=0,x,y,z} c_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k})\, \hat{s}_\mu \otimes \hat{\sigma}_\nu, \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{s}_\mu$ ($\hat{\sigma}_\nu$) are the Pauli matrices in orbital (spin) space. Hermiticity implies $c_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k}) = c^*_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k})$. Inversion maps $H_N(\mathbf{k})$ onto $U_P H_N(-\mathbf{k}) U_P^\dagger$, where $U_P = 1_4$ ($U_P = -1_4$) if the orbitals are both even (odd). The extra sign for the odd case obviously drops out and can be disregarded. Hence, for the Hamiltonian to be symmetric under inversion, we simply require $c_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k}) = c_{\mu,\nu}(-\mathbf{k})$. Time reversal maps $H_N(\mathbf{k})$ onto $U_T H_N^*(-\mathbf{k}) U_T^\dagger$. $c_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k})$ is thus mapped onto $c^*_{\mu,\nu}(-\mathbf{k}) = c_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k})$. Under the assumption of real-valued orbitals, $\hat{s}_y$ and the spin components $\hat{\sigma}_x$, $\hat{\sigma}_y$, $\hat{\sigma}_z$ are odd under time reversal, whereas the remaining matrices are even. This is achieved by $U_T = \hat{s}_0 \otimes i\hat{\sigma}_y$.

In order for the Hamiltonian $H_N(\mathbf{k})$ to be invariant under time reversal, only those Kronecker products can appear in Eq. (1) that are even, specifically the six products with $\{\mu,\nu\} = \{0,0\},\{x,0\},\{z,0\},\{y,x\},\{y,y\},\{y,z\}$. The corresponding $c_{\mu,\nu}(\mathbf{k})$ are real and even functions of $\mathbf{k}$. Note that the five nontrivial Kronecker products are mutually anticommuting and thus form a representation of the five Dirac matrices.

We now show that the generalized Luttinger-Kohn model [1] adopted in the main text is equivalent to Eq. (1). It is expressed in terms of the angular-momentum $j = 3/2$ matrices

$$J_x = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3} & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & \sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2}$$

$$J_y = \frac{i}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\sqrt{3} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3} & 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -\sqrt{3} \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3}$$

$$J_z = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -3 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

The generalized Luttinger-Kohn model involves five sets of products of the $j = 3/2$ matrices, specifically $(2J_z^2 - J_x^2 - J_y^2/6$, $(J_x^2 - J_y^2)/(2\sqrt{3})$, $(J_xJ_z + J_zJ_x)/(2\sqrt{3})$, $(J_xJ_y + J_yJ_x)/(2\sqrt{3})$, and $(J_yJ_z + J_zJ_y)/(2\sqrt{3})$. These matrices also form a set of five Dirac matrices and there is a unitary transformation between them and the five allowed nontrivial

Kronecker products discussed above. Specifically, we find

$$U^\dagger \frac{2J_z^2 - J_x^2 - J_y^2}{6} U = \hat{s}_z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_0, \tag{5}$$

$$U^\dagger \frac{J_x^2 - J_y^2}{2\sqrt{3}} U = \hat{s}_x \otimes \hat{\sigma}_0, \tag{6}$$

$$U^\dagger \frac{J_x J_z + J_z J_x}{2\sqrt{3}} U = \hat{s}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y, \tag{7}$$

$$U^\dagger \frac{J_x J_y + J_y J_x}{2\sqrt{3}} U = \hat{s}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_z, \tag{8}$$

$$U^\dagger \frac{J_y J_z + J_z J_y}{2\sqrt{3}} U = \hat{s}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x, \tag{9}$$

with the unitary matrix

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$

Note that one can pairwise swap the orbital-spin matrices $\hat{s}_\mu \otimes \hat{\sigma}_\nu$ by an appropriate unitary transformation so that this mapping is entirely general. We hence see that the generalized Luttinger-Kohn model is equivalent to the most general single-particle Hamiltonian of a time- and inversion-symmetric material with two identical-parity orbitals and spin. The generalized Luttinger-Kohn representation is convenient, however, as it allows us to exploit the symmetry properties of the angular-momentum matrices $J_i$ under rotations to gain insight into the underlying physics.

We can obtain six on-site pairing states in the orbital-spin representation by multiplying the six allowed Kronecker products by the unitary part of the time-reversal operator, $U_T = \hat{s}_0 \otimes i\hat{\sigma}_y$. We hence obtain one orbitally trivial spin-singlet gap proportional to $\hat{s}_0 \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y$ and five "anomalous" gaps proportional to $\hat{s}_x \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y$, $\hat{s}_z \otimes \hat{\sigma}_y$, $\hat{s}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_z$, $\hat{s}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_0$, and $\hat{s}_y \otimes \hat{\sigma}_x$, which are either orbital-triplet spin-singlet or orbital-singlet spin-triplet pairing states. It is straightforward to map these states onto the gap matrices in the equivalent spin-3/2 formulation: the orbitally trivial spin-singlet state maps onto the singlet gap matrix $\eta_s$, while the anomalous gaps map onto the quintet gap matrices. Hence, we can describe any even-parity pairing state, without loss of generality, in terms of a linear combination of the six spin-3/2 gap functions with even-parity coefficients $\psi_i(\mathbf{k})$.

## EXISTENCE AND PROPERTIES OF THE PFAFFIAN

In this section, we provide additional details on constructing the topological invariant protecting the Fermi surfaces. Our starting point is the Hamiltonian in the superconducting state,

$$H(\mathbf{k}) = \begin{pmatrix} H_N(\mathbf{k}) & \Delta(\mathbf{k}) \\ \Delta^\dagger(\mathbf{k}) & -H_N^T(\mathbf{k}) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{11}$$

Recall that $H_N(\mathbf{k})$ is even in $\mathbf{k}$. We employ the spin-3/2 basis used in the main text. We first show that a $\mathbf{k}$-independent unitary matrix $\Omega$ exists such that $\tilde{H}^T(\mathbf{k}) = -\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$ for $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) = \Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger$, i.e., the Hamiltonian can be transformed into antisymmetric form.

The proof proceeds as follows: 1. The Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{k})$ satisfies parity and charge-conjugation symmetries and thus also their product, i.e.,

$$U_{CP}\, H^T(\mathbf{k})\, U_{CP}^\dagger = -H(\mathbf{k}), \tag{12}$$

where $U_{CP} \equiv U_C U_P^* = (\hat{\tau}_x \otimes 1_4)(\hat{\tau}_0 \otimes 1_4) = \hat{\tau}_x \otimes 1_4$. The $\hat{\tau}_i$ denote Pauli matrices in particle-hole (Nambu) space. We find that the $CP$ symmetry squares to $+1$ since $(CP)^2 = (U_{CP}\mathcal{K})^2 = U_{CP}U_{CP}^* = \hat{\tau}_0 \otimes 1_4 = +1_8$. In the presence of such a symmetry, two-dimensional Fermi surfaces are characterized by a $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant [2, 3].

2. For *any* $CP$ symmetry that squares to unity we have $U_{CP}^* = U_{CP}^{-1} = U_{CP}^\dagger$ and thus $U_{CP} = U_{CP}^T$, hence $U_{CP}$ is symmetric. Any (complex) symmetric matrix can be diagonalized by a unitary *congruence*, i.e., there exist a unitary matrix $Q$ and a diagonal matrix $\Lambda$ such that (note the transpose)

$$U_{CP} = Q\Lambda Q^T. \tag{13}$$

Inserting this equation into Eq. (12) yields

$$Q\Lambda Q^T\, H^T(\mathbf{k})\, Q^*\Lambda^\dagger Q^\dagger = -H(\mathbf{k}). \tag{14}$$

Since $\Lambda = Q^\dagger U_{CP} Q^*$ is unitary and diagonal, it can be written as $\Lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$ with $|\lambda_i| = 1$. Now let

$$\sqrt{\Lambda} \equiv \mathrm{diag}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_1}, \sqrt{\lambda_2}, \ldots\right), \tag{15}$$

where for each $i$, $\sqrt{\lambda_i}$ is the complex root with arbitrary but fixed sign. Also let

$$\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger \equiv \mathrm{diag}\left(\sqrt{\lambda_1}^*, \sqrt{\lambda_2}^*, \ldots\right), \tag{16}$$

with the same choice of signs as in Eq. (15). It is trivial to show that this is a root of $\Lambda^\dagger$. Furthermore, $\sqrt{\Lambda}$ and $\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger$ are obviously diagonal, and thus symmetric, and also unitary. We can thus rewrite Eq. (14) as $Q\sqrt{\Lambda}\sqrt{\Lambda}Q^T H^T(\mathbf{k}) Q^* \sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger = -H(\mathbf{k})$ and find that

$$(\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger H(\mathbf{k}) Q\sqrt{\Lambda})^T = -\sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger H(\mathbf{k}) Q\sqrt{\Lambda}. \tag{17}$$

With the unitary matrix $\Omega \equiv \sqrt{\Lambda}^\dagger Q^\dagger$, Eq. (17) can be written as $(\Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger)^T = -\Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger$. Hence, $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \Omega H(\mathbf{k})\Omega^\dagger$ is indeed antisymmetric.

For the Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{k})$ given in Eq. (11) above together with Eq. (1) in the main text, a possible choice is

$$\Omega = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ i & -i \end{pmatrix} \otimes 1_4. \tag{18}$$

This yields

$$\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} H_N - H_N^T + \Delta + \Delta^\dagger & -i\,(H_N + H_N^T) + i\,(\Delta - \Delta^\dagger) \\ i\,(H_N + H_N^T) + i\,(\Delta - \Delta^\dagger) & H_N - H_N^T - \Delta - \Delta^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

where we have suppressed the argument $\mathbf{k}$. The terms involving the normal-state Hamiltonian $H_N$ are obviously antisymmetric. For this, it is crucial that $H_N$ is even in $\mathbf{k}$. From Eq. (12), one easily finds $\Delta^T = -\Delta$, which implies that also the superconducting terms in $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$ are antisymmetric. Hence, we do find $\tilde{H}^T(\mathbf{k}) = -\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$.

Since $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$ is antisymmetric, its Pfaffian $P(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \mathrm{Pf}\,\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$ exists. The Pfaffian is real for any spinful system since (a) the dimension of the Hamiltonian is a multiple of four ($2 \times 2$ for Nambu and spin space), thus the Pfaffian is a polynomial of even degree of the components of $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$, and (b) $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$ is hermitian and antisymmetric and thus these components are purely imaginary.

Note further that the ambiguity in the signs of the roots in $\sqrt{\Lambda}$ means that $\Omega$ can be multiplied on the left by a diagonal matrix $D$ with arbitrary components $\pm 1$ on the diagonal. With $\Omega \to D\Omega$ we get $\Omega^\dagger \to \Omega^\dagger D$ and $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) \to D\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})D$. This leads to $\mathrm{Pf}\,\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) \to \det D\,\mathrm{Pf}\,\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$. Hence, $P(\mathbf{k})$ is only determined up to an overall sign. But this sign is selected by fixing the root $\sqrt{\Lambda}$ once for all $\mathbf{k}$. Thus sign *changes* in $P(\mathbf{k})$ are meaningful.

Since $\det H(\mathbf{k}) = \det \tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) = P^2(\mathbf{k})$, the zeros of $P(\mathbf{k})$ give the nodes of the superconducting state. Thus if the Pfaffian changes sign as a function of $\mathbf{k}$, the surface separating regions with $P(\mathbf{k}) \gtrless 0$ is a two-dimensional Fermi surface. However, $P(\mathbf{k})$ can in addition have zeros of even multiplicity, which do not separate regions with different sign. These *accidental* zeros can form two-dimensional surfaces or line or point nodes.

For the general $k_z(k_x + ik_y)$ state of Eq. (4) in the main text, the Pfaffian is

$$P(\mathbf{k}) = (\epsilon_+\epsilon_-)^2 + 4\Delta_0^2\,(\epsilon_+\epsilon_- + c_{xz}^2 + c_{yz}^2) + \Delta_1^2\,|\psi|^2\,(\epsilon_+^2 + \epsilon_-^2) + 8\Delta_0\Delta_1\,c_0\,|\psi|^2 + \Delta_1^4\,|\psi|^4, \tag{20}$$

where $\epsilon_\pm(\mathbf{k})$ are the normal-state eigenenergies. We have chosen the signs in the root $\sqrt{\Lambda}$ in such a way that $P(\mathbf{k}) > 0$ in the limit of large $\mathbf{k}$. Equation (20) is correct for arbitrary real and even coefficients $c_i(\mathbf{k})$. Note that when $\Delta_0 = 0$, the equation $P(\mathbf{k}) = 0$ implies the usual relationship for zero-energy states in a spin-singlet superconductor, i.e., $(\epsilon_+^2 + \Delta_1^2\,|\psi|^2)(\epsilon_-^2 + \Delta_1^2\,|\psi|^2) = 0$, implying nodes when $\epsilon_\pm = 0$ and $\psi = 0$; since $\psi(\mathbf{k}) \propto c_{xz}(\mathbf{k}) + ic_{yz}(\mathbf{k})$ to ensure that the full gap function $\Delta(\mathbf{k})$ transforms under rotations like $Y_{2,1}(\hat{\mathbf{k}})$, we have line nodes in the $k_z = 0$ plane and point nodes along the line $k_x = k_y = 0$. With both $\Delta_0 \neq 0$ and $\Delta_1 \neq 0$, we see that along the nodal directions, for which $\psi \propto c_{xz} + ic_{yz} = 0$, we have zero-energy excitations for $\epsilon_+\epsilon_-(4\Delta_0^2 + \epsilon_+\epsilon_-) = 0$. The two solutions for $\epsilon_+\epsilon_-$ that follow from the latter equation give the two points of the Bogoliubov Fermi surface along these nodal directions. Away from

the nodal directions, the other terms in Eq. (20) no longer vanish. However, they are continuous functions of the direction $\hat{\mathbf{k}}$, implying that the Fermi surface still exists at least for a finite range away from the nodal directions. In the main text, we consider the special case of a pure quintet gap, $\Delta_1 = 0$.

Finally, we show that the Pfaffian can be chosen non-negative if the system is also time-reversal symmetric and the combined inversion and time-reversal symmetry squares to $-1$, i.e., if there exists a unitary matrix $U_{PT}$ so that $U_{PT} H^T(\mathbf{k}) U_{PT}^\dagger = H(\mathbf{k})$ and $U_{PT} U_{PT}^* = -1$. Hence, if both symmetries are present, the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ invariant exists but is necessarily trivial. This has essentially been shown using the method of Clifford algebra extensions in [2]. In the following, we give a more elementary proof.

1. Kramers' theorem shows that under the last two conditions all eigenvalues of $H(\mathbf{k})$ have even degeneracy. Furthermore, condition (12) above implies that the eigenvalues come in pairs $\{E_i(\mathbf{k}), -E_i(\mathbf{k})\}$. Since the dimension of $H(\mathbf{k})$ is a multiple of four, the spectrum thus consists of quadruplets $\{E_i(\mathbf{k}), E_i(\mathbf{k}), -E_i(\mathbf{k}), -E_i(\mathbf{k})\}$.

2. $P(\mathbf{k})$ is a polynomial of the components of $\tilde{H}(\mathbf{k})$, which are linear combinations of the components of $H(\mathbf{k})$. Hence, $P(\mathbf{k})$ is a polynomial of the components of $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{k})$. The coefficients are independent of $\mathbf{k}$.

3. We have $P^2(\mathbf{k}) = \det \tilde{H}(\mathbf{k}) = \det H(\mathbf{k}) = \prod_i E_i^4(\mathbf{k})$ so that $P(\mathbf{k}) = \pi(\mathbf{k}) \prod_i E_i^2(\mathbf{k})$ with $\pi(\mathbf{k}) = \pm 1$.

4. Consider the eigenenergies $E_i(\mathbf{k})$ as functions of a real parameter $h$, which can be any real or imaginary part of a component of the hermitian, finite-dimensional matrix $H(\mathbf{k})$. Theorem 7.6 of Alekseevsky *et al.* [4] shows under the weak additional condition that no two eigenvalues meet of infinite order for any real $h$ unless they are equal for all $h$ that the $E_i(\mathbf{k})$ can be chosen as smooth functions of $h$. Then $\prod_i E_i^2(\mathbf{k})$ is a smooth function of $h$.

5. We have already shown that $P(\mathbf{k})$ is a polynomial in $h$, that $\prod_i E_i^2(\mathbf{k}) = \pi(\mathbf{k})\, P(\mathbf{k})$ is a smooth function of $h$, and that $\pi(\mathbf{k}) = \pm 1$. Then $\pi(\mathbf{k})$ is constant.

6. Noting the ambiguity in choosing $\Omega$ and thus the overall sign of the Pfaffian, we can choose $\pi(\mathbf{k}) = +1$ at some $\mathbf{k}$ and consequently at all $\mathbf{k}$. Thus we indeed obtain $P(\mathbf{k}) = \prod_i E_i^2(\mathbf{k}) \geq 0$.

## STABILITY OF STATES WITH BROKEN TIME-REVERSAL SYMMETRY

In this section, we provide additional details on the free-energy expansion. We show that states with broken time-reversal symmetry featuring Bogoliubov Fermi surfaces can be energetically stable. The relative stability of spin-singlet broken-time-reversal states over time-reversal-invariant states with the same transition temperature has been attributed to the gapping of nodes that appear in the time-reversal-symmetric state by breaking this symmetry [5]. A common example is the chiral $d$-wave state with line nodes, for which the usual spin-singlet gap function takes the form $\psi(\mathbf{k}) = \psi_0\, k_z(\nu_x k_x + \nu_y k_y)$. In the broken-time-reversal state, we have $(\nu_x, \nu_y) = (1, i)/\sqrt{2}$, which leads to line nodes for $k_z = 0$ and point nodes at $k_x = k_y = 0$. In the nodal time-reversal-invariant state, we instead have $(\nu_x, \nu_y) = (1, 0)$, which also leads to line nodes for $k_z = 0$ and additional line nodes for $k_x = 0$. In this case, the broken-time-reversal state is believed to be stable because it gaps the $k_x = 0$ line node so that only two point nodes remain, gaining condensation energy. However, we have found that these point nodes become inflated $\mathbb{Z}_2$-protected Fermi surfaces, and it is reasonable to ask if the broken-time-reversal state is still stable.

We consider the spherically symmetric normal-state Hamiltonian $H_N(\mathbf{k}) = \alpha k^2 + \beta\, (\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{J})^2 - \mu$ and an on-site gap function that is a linear combination of $\eta_{xz}$ and $\eta_{yz}$. For this gap function, it is known that there are two essentially different possible ground states [5]: a time-reversal-invariant state $\Delta_r = (\bar{\Delta}/2)\, \eta_{xz}$ with $k_z k_x$ symmetry and a broken-time-reversal state $\Delta_a = (\bar{\Delta}/2\sqrt{2})\, (\eta_{xz} + i\eta_{yz})$ with $k_z(k_x + ik_y)$ symmetry. The time-reversal-invariant state $(\bar{\Delta}/2)\, \eta_{yz}$ is degenerate with $\Delta_r$. For these two states, the off-diagonal block in the Hamiltonian $H(\mathbf{k})$ reads

$$\Delta_r = \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\Delta_a = \frac{\bar{\Delta}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

respectively. These two matrices have been normalized such that $\mathrm{Tr}\, \Delta^\dagger \Delta = \bar{\Delta}^2$ ($\bar{\Delta}$ is assumed real).

Near $T_c$, the mean-field free energy can be expressed as a power series in $\Delta$. The expression is standard [6, 8],

$$F = \frac{1}{2V}\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\Delta^\dagger\Delta + \frac{k_BT}{2}\sum_{\mathbf{k},\omega_n}\sum_{l=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{l}\,\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Delta\tilde{G}(\mathbf{k},\omega_n)\Delta^\dagger G(\mathbf{k},\omega_n)\right]^l, \tag{23}$$

where the constant $V$ is the BCS pairing interaction (which is the same for $\Delta_a$ and $\Delta_r$), $\omega_n$ are the Matsubara frequencies, $T$ is the temperature, and the normal-state Green's functions $G$ and $\tilde{G}$ satisfy $[i\omega_n - H_N(\mathbf{k})]\,G(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) = 1$ and $[i\omega_n + H_N^T(\mathbf{k})]\,\tilde{G}(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) = 1$. To find $G$ and $\tilde{G}$, we note that $H_N^T(k_x,k_y,k_z) = H_N(k_x,-k_y,k_z)$ so that $\tilde{G}$ is given once we know $G$. Some algebra then gives

$$G(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) = G_+(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) + \left[\left(\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{J}\right)^2 - \frac{5}{4}\right]G_-(\mathbf{k},\omega_n), \tag{24}$$

$$\tilde{G}(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) = \tilde{G}_+(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) + \left[\left(\hat{\mathbf{k}}\cdot\mathbf{J}^T\right)^2 - \frac{5}{4}\right]\tilde{G}_-(\mathbf{k},\omega_n), \tag{25}$$

with

$$G_\pm(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{i\omega_n-\epsilon_1} \pm \frac{1}{i\omega_n-\epsilon_2}\right), \tag{26}$$

$$\tilde{G}_\pm(\mathbf{k},\omega_n) = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{i\omega_n+\epsilon_1} \pm \frac{1}{i\omega_n+\epsilon_2}\right), \tag{27}$$

$\epsilon_1 = (\alpha+9\beta/4)\,k^2-\mu$, and $\epsilon_2 = (\alpha+\beta/4)\,k^2-\mu$. Denoting the free energies for $\Delta_r$ and $\Delta_a$ by $F_r$ and $F_a$, respectively, we find, to fourth order in $\Delta$,

$$F_a - F_r \cong \frac{\bar{\Delta}^4 k_BT}{16}\sum_{\mathbf{k},\omega_n}\Big\{\tilde{G}_+^2G_+^2 + (1-2l_1l_{-1})\left(\tilde{G}_-^2G_+^2 + \tilde{G}_+^2G_-^2\right) + 4(l_1l_{-1}-1)\,\tilde{G}_-G_-\tilde{G}_+G_+ + (1-l_1^2l_{-1}^2)\,\tilde{G}_-^2G_-^2\Big\}, \tag{28}$$

where $l_{\pm1} = \sqrt{3}\,\cos\theta\sin\theta\,e^{\pm i\phi}$ and $\theta$ and $\phi$ are the spherical angles denoting the direction of $\mathbf{k}$. Note that the term of order $\Delta^2$ drops out of the free-energy difference under the integral over $\phi$. The analysis of the above expression reveals that either $\Delta_r$ or $\Delta_a$ can be stable, depending on the parameters. In particular, first consider the case of vanishing spin-orbit coupling, $\beta = 0$. In this limit, we find $\tilde{G}_- = G_- = 0$ so that only the first term in the sum in Eq. (28) survives, and we have $F_a > F_r$ so that $\Delta_r$ has lower free energy. This limit has also been considered in the context of $j = 3/2$ pairing in cold atoms [6, 7] and the results agree with what we find. Consequently, the broken-time-reversal state is not stable for $\beta = 0$.

Now consider the single-band limit, which can be reached, for example, by taking a large $|\beta|$, such that $\alpha + 9\beta/4$ and $\alpha + \beta/4$ have opposite sign, and a large chemical potential. If only $\epsilon_1$ crosses the Fermi surface, for sufficiently small $k_BT/\mu \ll 1$ we can safely take the limit $|\epsilon_2|/k_BT \to \infty$ to find the asymptotic expression

$$F_a - F_r \cong \frac{\bar{\Delta}^4}{1024k_BT}\sum_{\mathbf{k}} l_1^2l_{-1}^2\left(\frac{1 - k_BT\sinh(\epsilon_1/k_BT)/\epsilon_1}{\epsilon_1^2(1+\cosh(\epsilon_1/k_BT))}\right) < 0\,. \tag{29}$$

This is the result expected from single-band weak-coupling theory, and demonstrates that the broken time-reversal state is stable in this limit.

The above analysis implies that for fixed $\alpha$ and $\mu$ there will be a transition from $\Delta_a$ to $\Delta_r$ as a function of spin-orbit coupling $\beta$. It is straightforward to show that the momentum and Matsubara sum in Eq. (28) only depends on the dimensionless ratios $\beta/\alpha$ and $\mu/k_BT$, apart from prefactors that do not affect its sign. Numerical evaluation indicates that transitions exist for any value of $\mu/k_BT$. We consider explicitly the case of $|\beta| \ll \alpha$, in which the two spherical Fermi surfaces have nearly identical $k_F$. We then find by expanding in $\beta/\alpha$ that this transition takes place at $x \equiv |\beta|\mu/\alpha k_BT = |\beta|k_F^2/k_BT \approx 9.324$. For $x \lesssim 9.324$, we find that the time-reversal-invariant state $\Delta_r$ is the ground state, while for $x \gtrsim 9.324$, $\Delta_r$ is unstable towards $\Delta_a$. This indicates that the broken-time-reversal state is stabilized by modest spin-orbit coupling.

* agterber@uwm.edu

† philip.brydon@otago.ac.nz
‡ carsten.timm@tu-dresden.de

[1] J. M. Luttinger and W. Kohn, Motion of Electrons and Holes in Perturbed Periodic Fields, Phys. Rev. **97**, 869 (1955).
[2] S. Kobayashi, K. Shiozaki, Y. Tanaka, and M. Sato, Topological Blount's theorem of odd-parity superconductors, Phys. Rev. B **90**, 024516 (2014).
[3] Y. X. Zhao, A. P. Schnyder, and Z. D. Wang, Unified Theory of $PT$ and $CP$ Invariant Topological Metals and Nodal Superconductors, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 156402 (2016).
[4] D. Alekseevsky, A. Kriegl, P. W. Michor, and M. Losik, Choosing roots of polynomials smoothly, Israel J. Math. **105**, 203 (1998).
[5] M. Sigrist and K. Ueda, Phenomenological theory of unconventional superconductivity, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63**, 239 (1991).
[6] T. L. Ho and S.-K. Yip, Pairing of Fermions with Arbitrary Spin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 247 (1999).
[7] N. D. Mermin, $d$-wave pairing near the transition temperature, Phys. Rev. A **9**, 868 (1974).
[8] V. P. Mineev and K. V. Samokhin, *Introduction to Unconventional Superconductivity* (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1999).